REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 11, 2008. Claims 12-24 are presented for examination, of which Claims 12, 16, 19, 20, 22 and 24 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 12-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action states that "Applicant's specification failed to describe the newly added limitation 'a data stream having hierarchically-encoded data via a network.'"

Applicants respectfully submit that the recitation "a data stream having hierarchically-encoded data via a network" is clearly supported in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. For example, paragraphs [0011] and [0046]-[0076] of the specification discuss a technique of coding data using discrete wavelet transform (DWT) and paragraphs [0077]-[0080] discuss a technique of coding data on a SNR scalable basis (see also, paragraphs [0125-0126]). Both of these techniques constitute hierarchical encoding.

Claims 12-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,031,818 (Lo et al.).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action essentially repeats the same reasons for the rejection as set forth in the previous Office Action even though the claims were amended to recite the "hierarchically-encoded data" language. The Office Action states (page 8) "[t]he newly added

2

limitation hierarchically-encoded data is not supported by the specification. It is out of the scope of the invention. Therefore, applicant's argument is irrelevant. Lo teaches inputting multimedia data stream (See Fig. 1, Column 3, lines 26-Column 4, lines 23). Therefore, teach of Lo meets the claim limitation."

As discussed above, the "hierarchically-encoded data" language added to the claims is supported in the specification, and therefore the claims are allowable for the reasons set forth in the previous Amendment. In particular, Claim 12 is directed to an information processing apparatus for processing a data stream inputted via a network. The information processing apparatus includes: (1) an input unit for inputting a data stream having hierarchically-encoded data via a network; (2) an interrupted-stream storage unit for storing an interrupted stream generated by interrupting the data stream; (3) an interrupt information storage unit for storing interrupt information associated with the interrupted stream; and (4) an output unit for outputting the interrupted stream stored in the interrupted-stream storage unit, in response to a request for outputting the data stream. The interrupt information is at least one of a compression ratio, a signal-to-noise ratio, an amount of data, and a number of layers of the data stream.

Among other notable features of Claim 12 are: (1) an input unit for inputting a data stream having hierarchically-encoded data via a network; (2) an interrupted-stream storage unit for storing an interrupted stream generated by interrupting the data stream; (3) an interrupt information storage unit for storing interrupt information associated with the interrupted stream; and (4) an output unit for outputting the interrupted stream stored in the interrupted-stream storage unit, in response to a request for outputting the data stream, wherein the interrupt information is at least one of a compression ratio, a signal-to-noise ratio, an amount of data, and a number of layers

3

of the data stream   By virtue of the structure recited in Claim 12, efficient communication of hierarchically-encoded data, such as by the JP200 standard, can be attained.

Lo relates to a system for correcting errors in the transmission of data packets between a source and a receiver. Lo discusses sending a packet stream from a source to a client unit and a server unit. If the client unit detects an error in the packet stream, it will correct the error by requesting a retransmission of the lost packets from the server unit (not the source), and insert a copy of the lost packet into the proper time order to form a repaired packet stream, which is then sent to a receiver.

Lo discusses that the client units and server units operate on audio and video packet streams in the Real Time Transport Protocol (RTP) format, which incorporates a 16-bit sequence number field in the packet header. This field is used to detect lost or out of order packet arrivals, as well as to store and retrieve packets in playback and retransmit buffers. Lo also discusses that the playback buffer stores packets having payload fields containing an RTP or RTCP packet and header fields indicating the state of the packet. (i.e., valid_tab indicates whether the slot has a packet or a "hole" corresponding to a lost packet). However, Lo is silent as to hierarchically-encoded data streams and generating an interrupted data stream that is a partial data stream obtained by interrupting the original data stream. Thus, we have found nothing in Lo that would teach or suggest "an input unit for inputting a data stream having hierarchically-encoded data via a network," "an interrupted-stream storage unit for storing an interrupted stream generated by interrupting the data stream," "an interrupt information storage unit for storing interrupt information associated with the interrupted stream" or "an output unit for outputting the interrupted stream stored in said interrupted-stream storage unit, in response to a request for

4

outputting the data stream, wherein the interrupt information is at least one of a compression ratio, a signal-to-noise ratio, an amount of data, and a number of layers of the data stream," as recited in Claim 12 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 12 is not anticipated by Lo.

As noted in the previous Amendment, the Office Action broadly cites either column 3, line 26 - column 4, line 23 or column 4, line 24 - column 5, line 47 as disclosing each of these features. Applicants again respectfully request that, if a further Office Action is issued, the Examiner specifically point out where in these columns each of these features is found.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 12.

Independent Claims 16 and 19 are method and memory medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 12, and are believed to be patentable over Lo for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 12. Additionally, independent Claims 20, 22 and 24 include features substantially similar to those of Claim 12. Accordingly, Claims 20, 22 and 24 believed to be patentable over Lo, for reasons substantially the same as those discussed above in connection with Claim 12.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Response After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Response After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200